



## **CITY OF HAYWARD**

### **AGENDA REPORT**

Planning Commission

Meeting Date: 07/12/01

Agenda Item 4

**TO:** Planning Commission

**FROM:** Director of Public Works

**SUBJECT:** Draft Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Report (Draft EA/EIR)  
for the Airport Master Plan

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

It is recommended that the Planning Commission review and comment on the Draft EA/EIR.

#### **BACKGROUND:**

In 1998, the City Council authorized staff to work with the firm of Coffman Associates to prepare an Airport Master Plan Update ("Master Plan"). The final Master Plan was presented to the City Council at a work session held on July 18, 2000. At its October 11, 2000 meeting, the Alameda County Airport Land Use Commission found the Master Plan consistent with its Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan. In addition to preparing the Master Plan, Coffman Associates was instructed to prepare a joint Environmental Assessment/ Environmental Impact Report ("EA/EIR") to comply with both the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), and the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA"). Subsequently, Coffman Associates subcontracted with Environmental Science Associates ("ESA") to prepare the required environmental documents.

The Master Plan encompasses approximately 521 acres of City-owned property, designated as the Hayward Executive Airport. As directed by the City Council, the objectives of the Master Plan attempt to forecast the magnitude of changes that can be expected over the planning period, which extends through the year 2020. When adopted, the Master Plan will provide a framework for reviewing airport development concepts, capital improvements, and future development proposals. The City will balance the need to enhance the Airport's revenue generation with the overall environmental concerns of the surrounding communities.

The Draft EA/EIR has been prepared as a "program EIR." Therefore, the Draft EA/EIR recognizes that further environmental reviews may be necessary for subsequent specific development projects. The Notice of Preparation of an EA/EIR was distributed in March 2000. The Notice of Availability for the Draft EA/EIR was published on April 23, 2001.

## **DISCUSSION:**

The City Council reviewed this report during its worksession on July 10, 2001. The purpose of this presentation is to review the findings and to provide an opportunity for Planning Commission members to comment on the Draft EA/EIR. The close of the official review period is July 23, 2001. The Draft EA/EIR, together with the comments and responses received during the public hearing period, will comprise the Final EA/EIR, which the City Planning Commission must certify as accurate and complete before it can take action on the proposed project.

The purpose of the improvements recommended in the Master Plan (previously distributed for your review) is to provide a balanced complex of airside and landside facilities needed to accommodate increases in aviation demand forecast through 2020. With or without implementation of the Master Plan, aviation activity at Hayward is expected to grow through the end of the planning period. Demand at Hayward is expected to increase due to growth in the population of the nearby communities, strength of national and regional economies in general, and expansion of business and industry that has occurred in Alameda County in particular. Growth in the demand for aviation services at Hayward is projected to include a shift to use by larger aircraft, creating new runway demands, as well as increases in total aircraft operations.

The Draft EA/EIR provides a description of the environmental setting, identifies environmental impacts, and lists mitigation measures that could reduce potentially significant impacts to less-than-significant levels. The Draft EA/EIR identifies potentially significant impacts in the following areas: land use, air quality, water quality, endangered and threatened species, floodplains, construction impacts, seismicity and hazardous materials. The Alternatives Evaluation Matrix (Table S-3 in the Draft EA/EIR) is attached for your convenience as Exhibit A. All of the impacts identified as potentially significant could be reduced to less-than-significant levels through implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

The Draft EA/EIR discusses the No Action, Proposed Action and Alternative 'A' alternatives for a qualitative comparison of the potential impacts of these alternatives. The intent of the alternatives evaluation in the Draft EA/EIR is to assure that reasonable alternatives, which may enhance environmental quality or may have a less detrimental effect on the environment, have been considered. The Draft EA/EIR also discusses other alternatives considered but withdrawn from detailed evaluation. These include improvements at another regional airport, and relocating the Hayward Airport or constructing a new facility. An alternatives evaluation matrix which compares the environmental consequences effects of these three alternatives (Table 2-4 in the Draft EA/EIR), is attached for reference as Exhibit B.

### **Master Plan Improvements**

Short-term Master Plan Improvements (2000-2005): Projects proposed for implementation before 2005, include improvements to the Airport's runways and taxiways, apron areas, navigation aids, and service roads, as well as construction of new general aviation facilities and a noise wall. The existing Runway 28L entrance taxiway would be widened and designated as part of the runway,

effectively extending useable runway length for departures only, by 860 feet. Runway 28R would also be extended 350 feet to the south east as a result of the displaced threshold. A new exit taxiway would be constructed and existing Taxiway Z would be relocated. The east perimeter service road would be constructed and a noise wall would be constructed on the Runway 10L holding apron. New T-hangars would be constructed and Phase 1 improvements for the Corsair Executive Hangars would be completed.

Long-term Master Plan Improvements (2006-2020): Projects proposed for implementation by the year 2020, include the installation of runway end identification lights on Runway 10L-28R, construction of T-hangar access taxilanes to the South Executive Hangars, a public terminal building and associated automobile parking. A helipad for transient helicopter users would be constructed in the north east section of the Airport. In addition, portions of the north apron would be expanded. The west perimeter road and the south access roads would be constructed. Phase 2 improvements for the Corsair Executive Hangars would be completed. New T-hangars would be constructed adjacent to Taxiway Z, as well as additional executive hangars, apron, automobile parking and access roads. Construction of up to 900,000 square feet of aviation-related development and 320,000 square feet of commercial/industrial development adjacent to West Winton Avenue is contemplated in the Master Plan by 2020. In addition, development could occur on about 6.3 acres of lease parcels for fixed-based operators (FBOs) and on about one acre of lease parcels for commercial/industrial uses.

### **Proposed Action**

The Master Plan Improvements, summarized above, provide an overview of all the proposed Master Plan projects under the Proposed Action.

### **Alternative 'A'**

This alternative is similar to the Proposed Action, in that it would include the same general aviation facilities (i.e., hangar spaces and associated facilities), provide a general aviation public terminal building, provide the same landside facilities, and accommodate the same number of aircraft operations as the Proposed Action in 2005 and 2020. The two primary differences between this alternative and the Proposed Action are that under Alternative 'A', there would not be a displaced threshold (runway extension) constructed at either runway, and none of the commercial, industrial, or aviation-related development on the south side of the Airport that is assumed under the Proposed Action, would be undertaken.

### **No Action Alternative**

The No Action Alternative assumes that none of the development proposed in the Proposed Action and in Alternative 'A' would occur. Accordingly, none of the airside improvements described under the Proposed Action or the landside improvements described under the Proposed Action and Alternative 'A' would be constructed.

## Environmental Consequences of Noise and Traffic

While the importance of all environmental consequences are significant, the studies tending to generate the most public interest are Section 4.1 NOISE, and Section 4.3-1 TRANSPORTATION (Vehicle Traffic). With respect to noise, the Proposed Action will actually reduce aircraft noise exposures to nearby residents. Such is the case for not only mobile home park residents on West Winton (east side of Airport), but the Village of San Lorenzo Homeowners as well (west side of the Airport). This is due to the mitigation of noise created by the effectiveness of the sound berm located on the eastern-most end of the Airport. By constructing a *Displaced Threshold* on Runway 28L, we are effectively relocating the end of the runway closer to the berm. This will allow its intended purpose to be more efficient by acting as an "obstacle" to any noise generated from aircraft departing on that runway. Also, departing aircraft will attain greater airspeed further from the San Lorenzo neighborhood. Thus, aircraft will be able to climb earlier and either turn away from San Lorenzo sooner or, if necessary, achieve a higher altitude prior to overflight of that area. Actual noise analysis and recordings, which prove the effectiveness of the berm, have been accomplished.

An analysis of Master Plan vehicle traffic impacts concludes: "Neither the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Action, nor Alternative A would have significant impacts on traffic operating conditions at intersections, or on Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS) roadways, within the study area. In addition, none of the alternatives would have significant impacts on traffic safety, or on public transit service provided by AC Transit and BART in the study area." Therefore, no mitigation is required because no significant impacts related to transportation would result from the Master Plan and its proposed projects.

Prepared by:

  
Dennis L. Butler

Director of Public Works

### Attachments:

Exhibit A: Alternatives Evaluation Matrix (Table S-3 in the Draft EA/EIR)

Exhibit B: Comparison Alternatives Evaluation Matrix (Table 2-4 in the Draft EA/EIR)

**TABLE S-3  
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION MATRIX**

<b>Environmental Topic</b>	<b>No Action Alternative Consequences</b>	<b>Proposed Action (Master Plan Improvements) Consequences</b>	<b>Alternative A Consequences</b>
Noise – Aircraft Noise Impacts	LS	LS	LS
Noise – Surface Traffic Impacts	LS	LS	LS
Noise – Construction Noise Impacts	LS	LS	LS
Land Use - Changes in On-Airport Land Uses	LS	S/LS	LS
Land Use - Adjacent Land Use Compatibility	S	LS	S/LS
Social - Increase in Traffic at Intersections	LS	LS	LS
Social - Increase in Traffic on Regional Roadways	LS	LS	LS
Social - Traffic Safety	LS	LS	LS
Social - Public Transit Service	LS	LS	LS
Social - Permanent Employment	LS	LS	LS
Social - Construction Employment	LS	LS	LS
Social - Housing Demand	LS	LS	LS
Social – Indirect Employment and Housing Demand	LS	LS	LS
Social – Minority Populations	LS	LS	LS
Social – Low-Income Populations	LS	LS	LS
Socioeconomics – Schools	LS	LS	LS

No Impact = -

Less than Significant Impact = LS

Significant Impact = S

Less than Significant with Mitigation = S/LS

**TABLE S-3 (Continued)**  
**ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION MATRIX**

Environmental Topic	No Action Alternative Consequences	Proposed Action (Master Plan Improvements) Consequences	Alternative A Consequences
Socioeconomics – Hospitals	LS	LS	LS
Socioeconomics – Parks	LS	LS	LS
Socioeconomics – Police	LS	LS	LS
Socioeconomics – Fire	LS	LS	LS
Socioeconomics – Water	LS	LS	LS
Socioeconomics – Wastewater	LS	LS	LS
Air Quality – Regional Emissions	LS	S/LS	S/LS
Air Quality – Local Concentrations	LS	S/LS	S/LS
Water Quality – Surface Water Quality	S/LS	S/LS	S/LS
Water Quality – Groundwater	LS	LS	LS
Section 303 – Constructive Use	-	LS	LS
Cultural – Historical Resources	-	LS	LS
Cultural – Identifies Archaeological Resources	-	LS	LS
Cultural – Unidentified Archeological Resources	-	LS	LS
Biological Resource – Bird Strikes	LS	LS	LS
Biological Resources – Common Vegetation and Wildlife	LS	LS	LS
Biological Resources – Foraging Habitat	LS	LS	LS

No Impact = -

Less than Significant Impact = LS

Significant Impact = S

Less than Significant with Mitigation = S/LS

EXHIBIT A

**TABLE S-3 (Continued)**  
**ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION MATRIX**

Environmental Topic	No Action Alternative Consequences	Proposed Action (Master Plan Improvements) Consequences	Alternative A Consequences
Endangered and Threatened Species	-	S/LS	S/LS
Other Special-Status Species	-	LS	LS
Wetlands	-	LS	LS
Floodplains – Floodplain Encroachment	-	LS	LS
Floodplains - On-Site Flooding	-	S/LS	S/LS
Floodplains – Storage Capacity	-	LS	LS
Coastal Zone Management	-	-	-
Coastal Barriers	-	-	-
Wild and Scenic Rivers	-	-	-
Farmland	-	-	-
Energy – Energy Consumption	LS	LS	LS
Energy - Demand	LS	LS	LS
Light Emissions	LS	LS	LS
Solid Waste Impacts	LS	LS	LS
Construction Impacts – Noise	-	LS	LS
Construction Impacts – Air Quality	-	S/LS	S/LS
Construction Impacts – Water Quality	-	S/LS	S/LS

No Impact = -

Less than Significant Impact = LS

Significant Impact = S

Less than Significant with Mitigation = S/LS

EXHIBIT A

**TABLE S-3 (Continued)**  
**ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION MATRIX**

Environmental Topic	No Action Alternative Consequences	Proposed Action (Master Plan Improvements) Consequences	Alternative A Consequences
Construction Impacts – Hazardous Materials	-	S/LS	S/LS
Visual Character	-	LS	LS
Geology	LS	LS	LS
Seismicity	LS	S/LS	S/LS
Hazardous Materials – Fuel Storage and Spill Impacts	LS	LS	LS
Hazardous Materials – Hazardous Materials Transport	LS	LS	LS
Hazardous Materials – Storage of Hazardous Materials	LS	LS	LS
Hazardous Materials – Hazardous Waste Generation	-	-	-
Hazardous Materials – Exposure of Workers to Hazardous Materials	LS	S/LS	S/LS

EXHIBIT A

SOURCE: Summary of Environmental Consequences presented in Chapter 4 of this document.

No Impact = -  
 Less than Significant Impact = LS  
 Significant Impact = S  
 Less than Significant with Mitigation = S/LS



TABLE 2-4  
ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION MATRIX

Environmental Topic	No Action Alternative Consequences	Proposed Action (Master Plan Update) Consequences Compared to the No Action Alternative	Alternative A Consequences Compared to the No Action Alternative
Noise	Continuation of existing Airport conditions would see no change in landside and airside facilities at HWD, although operations would increase. However, this increase would result in a less than significant impact in regards to aircraft noise impacts, surface traffic noise impacts, and construction noise impacts.	Impacts would be the same as the No Action Alternative.	Impacts would be the same as the No Action Alternative.
* Compatible Land Use	<p>Continuation of existing Airport operations would not result in direct changes to allowed land uses or land use designations at HWD. Existing on-Airport land uses would continue to be consistent and compatible with relevant plans and policies. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>The off-Airport obstructions that penetrate height restrictions for the FAR Part 77 safety zones would continue to be present. This would constitute a significant land use compatibility impact.</p>	<p>The Proposed Action would neither physically divide an established community nor conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. On-Airport land use impacts are considered less than significant.</p> <p>The off-Airport obstructions that penetrate height restrictions for the FAR Part 77 safety zones would continue to be present. The implementation of mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. (page 4-59)*</p>	<p>Impacts would be the same as the Proposed Action.</p> <p>Impacts would be the same as the Proposed Action.</p>
Social Impacts	Intersections and regional roadways in the HWD vicinity would operate at an acceptable level of service, constituting a less-than-significant impact. Traffic safety impacts would be less than significant. Indirect and Direct employment generated would pose a less than significant impact. No disproportionate effects on low-income or minority populations would occur.	Impacts would be the same as the No Action Alternative.	Impacts would be the same as the No Action Alternative.

**TABLE 2-4 (Continued)**  
**ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION MATRIX**

Environmental Topic	No Action Alternative Consequences	Proposed Action ( <i>Master Plan Update</i> ) Consequences Compared to the No Action Alternative	Alternative A Consequences Compared to the No Action Alternative
Induced Socioeconomic Impacts	Less than significant impacts to schools, hospitals, parks and recreation, fire protection and emergency services, and police protection services. Less than significant increase in the demand for water and wastewater.	Impacts would be similar to the No Action Alternative.	Impacts would be similar to the No Action Alternative.
* Air Quality	The impacts of regional emissions and local concentrations on air quality would be less than significant.	With the implementation of mitigation measures during construction, the impacts of regional emissions and local concentrations on air quality would be less than significant. (page 4-126)*	Impacts would be the same as the Proposed Action.
* Water Quality	With continued implementation of the Airport's Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, increased opportunity for releases of contaminants into surface waters and the groundwater would be less than significant.	Increase in the opportunity for releases of contaminants into surface waters and groundwater as a result of the operation and construction of new facilities. Implementation of the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and National Pollution Discharge Elimination System will reduce the impact to less than significant. (page 4-142)*	Impacts would be the same as the Proposed Action.
Section 303	No acquisition of any Section 303 property and no constructive use of any Section 303 property.	Same as the No Action Alternative.	Impacts would be the same as the No Action Alternative.
Cultural Resources	No physical changes to the Airport would occur, and therefore no impact on historic, architectural, archaeological, or cultural resources.	Disturbance of historical resources and/or identified and known archeological resources would be a less than significant impact (SHPO consultation is ongoing). Discovery of previously unknown archeological resources exists, which would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.	Impacts would be the same as the Proposed Action.

**TABLE 2-4 (Continued)**  
**ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION MATRIX**

Environmental Topic	No Action Alternative Consequences	Proposed Action ( <i>Master Plan Update</i> ) Consequences Compared to the No Action Alternative	Alternative A Consequences Compared to the No Action Alternative
Biotic Communities	Bird strikes would increase proportionally to increased air traffic; less than significant impact. Common vegetation is currently regularly disturbed, and there is no known foraging or nesting habitat for sensitive bird species; less than significant impact.	Impacts would be similar to the No Action Alternative.	Impacts would be similar to the No Action Alternative.
* Threatened and Endangered Species	No impacts to endangered or threatened species would occur.	Impacts to endangered and other legally sensitive species (especially amphibians) during construction would be less than significant with mitigation. (page 4-180) *	Impacts would be similar to the Proposed Action (i.e., less than significant), but less adverse due to no lengthening of the runway.
Wetlands	No impacts to wetlands would occur.	Impacts to Sulphur Creek as a result of construction of Taxiway Z and the Exit Taxiway would be less than significant.	Impacts would be the same as the Proposed Action.
* Floodplains	No floodplain encroachment into the 100-year floodplain, on-site flooding, or loss of flood storage capacity would occur.	Same impacts related to floodplain encroachment. Increase in the possibility for on-site flooding and a decrease in on-site flood storage capacity resulting from an increase in impervious surfaces at the Airport. Impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. (page 4-200) *	Impacts would be the same as the Proposed Action.
Coastal Zone Management Program	Excluding Skywest Golf Course, the closest portion of HWD lies approximately 2,800 feet east of Hayward Regional Shoreline. Neither the Proposed Action nor Alternative A proposes any actions in the vicinity of the western most portion of HWD.	Same as the No Action Alternative.	Impacts would be the same as the No Action Alternative.
Coastal Barriers	HWD is not within the Coastal Barrier Resources System and no effects would occur.	Same as the No Action Alternative.	Impacts would be the same as the No Action Alternative.

**TABLE 2-4 (Continued)**  
**ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION MATRIX**

<b>Environmental Topic</b>	<b>No Action Alternative Consequences</b>	<b>Proposed Action (<i>Master Plan Update</i>) Consequences Compared to the No Action Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative A Consequences Compared to the No Action Alternative</b>
Wild and Scenic River	HWD is not located near any wild and scenic river and no effects would occur.	Same as the No Action Alternative.	Impacts would be the same as the No Action Alternative.
Farmland	No prime farmland would be affected.	Same as the No Action Alternative.	Impacts would be the same as the No Action Alternative.
Energy Supply and Natural Resources	Increase in energy consumption and increases in demand on the local distribution infrastructure would be less than significant.	Same as the No Action Alternative.	Impacts would be the same as the Proposed Action.
Light Emissions	Increase in surface vehicles and aircraft operations would generate additional glare during the day and add to existing illumination levels during the evening and nighttime. This would be a less than significant impact.	Additional new stationary lighting at new facilities at HWD would increase lighting. But overall, this alternative would have the same impact as the No Action Alternative.	Impacts would be the same as the Proposed Action.
Solid Waste Impacts	Increase in solid waste generated at HWD and compliance with FAA Order 5200.5A would constitute a less than significant impact.	Same as the No Action Alternative.	Impacts would be the same as the No Action Alternative.
* Construction Impacts	No construction would occur.	The potential for significant construction noise impacts would be relatively low, with the exception of annoyance-type impacts associated with temporary construction activities. Therefore, this would be a less-than-significant impact. With mitigation, impacts to air quality, water quality, erosion, and workers exposure to hazardous substances would be less than significant. (page 4-225)*	Impacts would be the same as the Proposed Action.

**TABLE 2-4 (Continued)**  
**ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION MATRIX**

Environmental Topic	No Action Alternative Consequences	Proposed Action ( <i>Master Plan Update</i> ) Consequences Compared to the No Action Alternative	Alternative A Consequences Compared to the No Action Alternative
Design, Art and Architecture	No change in visual character would occur.	The construction of new facilities at HWD would no substantial change or degrade the exiting visual character. This would be a less than significant impact.	Impacts would be the same as the Proposed Action.
* Geology and Seismicity	The increase in the general aviation activity would increase the number of people exposed to seismic activity. Otherwise, the lack of construction would result in less than significant geologic impacts.	New construction would be required to meet seismic safety building codes. Same increase in the number of people exposed to seismic activity. These would be less than significant impacts with incorporated mitigation. (page 4-240)*	Impacts would be the same as the Proposed Action.
* Hazardous Materials	Fuel storage facility and spill impacts would be less than significant with existing rules and regulations associated with fueling. Hazardous materials transportation impacts are low, and would be less than significant. Storage and use of other hazardous materials, and exposure of workers to hazardous materials would all result in less than significant impacts. Hazardous waste generation would result in no impact.	All impacts would be the same as the No Action Alternative except that the exposure of workers to hazardous materials could pose a significant impact and would require the implementation of mitigation measures. (page 4-263)*	Impacts would be the same as the Proposed Action.

SOURCE: Summary of Environmental Consequences presented in Chapter 4 of this document.